RESP. DATED APRIL 30, 2008

RESP. TO OFFICE ACTION OF JANUARY 31, 2008

REMARKS

ATTY. DOCKET No.: 2002P12040US01

This paper is submitted in response to the pending Office Action mailed on January 31, 2008. Because this Response is submitted with a certificate of electronic filing in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.8 on or before the shortened period for reply set to expire on April 30, 2008, this Response is timely filed.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS ١.

Prior to this Response, claims 10 to 34¹ were pending and at issue. By this Response, none of the pending claims 10 to 34 have been amended or canceled and no new claims have been added. Thus, claims 10 to 34 remain pending and at issue in this application.

While Applicants believe that no additional fees are due in connection with this application, Applicants direct the Office to charge Deposit Account No. 23-1925 for any fees deemed owed in connection with this Response.

II. **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

The Office Action rejects: claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite; claims 10 to 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,143,048 to Ruben et al. ("Ruben") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062218 to Pianin ("Pianin").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 11 as indefinite. particular, Applicants call attention to paragraphs [0025] and [0102] to [0110] of the as-published application (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0143474). Applicants submit that an exemplary meaning and/or definition of the disputed limitation "call status" may be determined from a review of these paragraphs. In light of the exemplary disclosure cited herein, Applicants submit that claim 11 is definite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejection.

Applicants note that the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 1 to 34 are pending. However in a Preliminary Amendment dated April 1, 2004, original claims 1 to 9 were canceled and new claims 10 to 34 were submitted. Thus, claims 10 to 34 are pending and at issue in this application.

ATTY. DOCKET No.: 2002P12040US01

APPL. No. 10/629,229 RESP. DATED APRIL 30, 2008 RESP. TO OFFICE ACTION OF JANUARY 31, 2008

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 10 to 34 as obvious over the combination of *Ruben* and *Pianin* because the combination fails to disclose each and every element recited in the claims. Thus, the relied upon combination fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In particular, independent claims 10, 18 and 27 generally recite, in relevant part, a computer implemented method and a system for providing service information about a plurality of building site that includes a web portal comprising a database for storing service information about a plurality of building sites. Stated another way, the computer implemented method and system of:

[t]he present invention provides a customer web portal (CWP) enables external users to access reports or other summaries that may be generated by applications operating on the data mart. This Web access enables data mining applications and the historical database to be maintained at a common site rather than requiring every building site to have its own database and data mining applications. At the same time, the present invention will allow users to access their service information, enable them to place online service requests, access work orders, service histories and service contract details. The present invention will allow users oversee service activities more efficiently. The CWP 48 also offers resources such as user forums and email. See paragraph [0068] of the as-published application. *Emphasis added*.

Contrary to the relied upon characterization set forth in the Office Action on page 2, line 23 to page 3, line 3, *Ruben* does not disclose a web portal comprising a database for storing service information about a plurality of building sites. Rather, *Ruben* system for managing real estate in which **each individual property** is assigned a domain name accessible via the Internet. In other words, each real estate property has a web page assigned to it that allows property owners to obtain information about **that** property through its specific web page. As discussed above, the individual web pages of *Ruben* are not web portals that "enable[] external users to access reports or other summaries that may be generated by applications operating on the data mart."

Pianin does not disclose the teaching missing from Ruben. Pianin is simply a website to assist real estate agents in performing due diligence work such as

APPL. No. 10/629,229

RESP. DATED APRIL 30, 2008

RESP. TO OFFICE ACTION OF JANUARY 31, 2008

ATTY. DOCKET No.: 2002P12040US01

property appraisals on a building being sold, rented or otherwise contracted. Pianin

does not disclose a computer implemented method and system for providing service

information about a plurality of building site that includes a web portal comprising a

database for storing service information about a plurality of building sites to allow

users to access their service information, enable users to place online service

requests, access work orders, service histories, service contract details and

otherwise oversee service activities efficiently.

Because Ruben alone or in combination with Pianin fails to disclose a

computer implemented method and a system for providing service information about

a plurality of building site that includes a web portal comprising a database for

storing service information about a plurality of building sites, these references alone

or in combination cannot establish a prima facie case obviousness. For at least

these reasons, Applicants submit that the claims 10 to 34 are patentable and in

condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal and

reconsideration of the pending rejections.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the

pending rejections and submits that the above-identified patent application is now in

condition for allowance and earnestly solicits reconsideration of same.

Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in

any way in expediting prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 30, 2008

BY: /Matthew T. Ridsdale/

Matthew T. Ridsdale Reg. No. 56,832

Cust. No. 28524

Direct: (312) 245-5311

mridsdale@brinkshofer.com

PAGE 4 OF 4